

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,370	12/20/2001	Robert Uyeki	23484-031	9654
. 36614 7:	590 10/24/2006		EXAMINER	
MANATT PH	HELPS AND PHILLIPS		RUHL, DENN	IS WILLIAM
ROBERT D. B			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1001 PAGE M.	ILL ROAD, BUILDING 2		ART ONT	
PALO ALTO, CA 94304			3629	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/027,370	UYEKI, ROBERT			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dennis Ruhl	3629	•		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		<u>.</u>			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in content of the c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	•			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further composition (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beauting and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); etter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below); ducing or simplifying	·		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		Il be entered and an e	explanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a Name of the sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and		
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered become seen consider	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				
13. Other:			``		
	. (///2	\neg		
	P	DENNIS RUHL PRIMARY EXAGA			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner simply disagrees with applicant on what the claimed "geo-fencing means" is. The GPS system of Klein can be used to account for vehicles entering or leaving a designated area, just as the claim recites. This is because by using GPS, you know where a specific vehicle is located, which allows one to determine if the vehicle is inside or outisde of a given area. If a vehicle is located in the District of Columbia and the GPS system reflects this fact, this allows one to determine when and if the vehicle enters Virginia. A GPS system does the function that the claim requires in the "wherein" clause. This is a function that is provided by a GPS system. The examiner notes that applicant has not addressed the examiner's comments concerning 112,6th and the fact that the language "geo-fencing means" does not satisfy one of the 3 requirements to be given a 112,6th interpretation; however, applicant seems to be arguing a 112,6th interpretation. Also, claim 2 specifically recites a GPS system, which is what Klein discloses. The argument that the geo-fencing means is not a GPS system is non-persuasive.